

**FY 03 LOCAL PROJECTS GRANTS
TDH CENTRAL OFFICE EVALUATION PACKET**

NAME OF APPLICANT_____

DATE _____

REGION_____

Proposal Eligibility Checklist

APPLICANT

Yes	No	N/A	Applicant is a licensed EMS provider providing 911 service, registered first responder organization, or other approved EMS organization
Yes	No	N/A	All required signatures including Medical Director
Yes	No	N/A	Original plus one copy postmarked or received @ Bureau & two copies postmarked or received in PHR by deadline
Yes	No	N/A	Proposal does not exceed 5 pages per entity, including attachments (excluding the required TDH forms).
Yes	No	N/A	Proposal is typed or computer generated (application forms may be handwritten).
Yes	No	N/A	Proposal includes all applicable forms.
Yes	No	N/A	Proposal offers matching funds if required for items requested.
Yes	No	N/A	Applicant is in compliance with TSA policy and procedures and EMS standard of care criteria.
Yes	No	N/A	Proposal would not result in the substitution of LPG funds for funds from the organization's present or future operating or capital budget;
Yes	No	N/A	Applicant (provider) license Has not been found guilty of a priority level I or a priority level II violation within the last two years

TDH Evaluator _____

Date _____

EEE Team Evaluation: Clear History:— No history in last 2 years: — History of violation priority level III or IV: —

Instructions for Local Project Grants Application Scoring

The **Grading Criteria** section should be scored according to the following guidelines:

For criteria that can be scored “0-5-10”:

If evidence of a criterion is absent or completely unsatisfactory, it should be scored “0”.

If evidence of a criterion is partially met, it should be scored “5”.

If evidence of a criterion is addressed in full, it should be scored “10”.

For criteria that can be scored “0-10-20”:

If evidence of a criterion is absent or completely unsatisfactory, it should be scored “0”.

If evidence of a criterion is partially met, it should be scored “10”.

If evidence of a criterion is addressed in full, it should be scored “20”.

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH LOCAL PROJECT GRANTS

Grading Criteria for Local Project Grants

APPLICANT _____

CRITERION	MAXIMUM POINTS TO BE AWARDED	POINTS AWARDED
1. The proposal clearly prioritizes problems and identifies solutions.		
a. The problems are supported by statistical information.	0-5-10	
b. The project objectives related to each problem are clearly identified in the proposal. (if appropriate)	0 – 5-10	
c. The project objectives are measurable.	0 – 10-20	
Total	40	
Evaluation justification:		

CRITERION	MAXIMUM POINTS TO BE AWARDED	POINTS AWARDED
2. The proposal includes a plan for evaluating the accomplishment of each objective.		
a. The plan determines the degree to which each objective has been met.	0 – 5-10	
b. The plan includes a process for data collection and analysis. (if appropriate)	0 – 5-10	
c. The plan specifies when and how the evaluation will be compiled.	0 – 5-10	
d. The plan identifies how the overall success of the projects will be determined.	0 – 10-20	
Total	50	
Evaluation justification:		

CRITERION	MAXIMUM POINTS TO BE AWARDED	POINTS AWARDED
3. The proposal includes a specific plan for the continuation of the projects.		
a. The plan specifies that the equipment will be maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendations. *	0 – 5-10	
b. The plan outlines that the ambulance will be maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendations. *	0 – 5-10	
c. The plan includes a plan to support ongoing educational needs. *	0 – 5-10	
* If a, b, or c do not apply to the particular applicant, the applicant should be scored the maximum points.		
d. The plan assures the continuation of the projects beyond the scope of the grant.	0 –10-20	
Total	50	
Evaluation justification:		

CRITERION	MAXIMUM POINTS TO BE AWARDED	POINTS AWARDED
4. The proposal provides information related to past successes in completing projects or administering grant-funded programs.		
a. The applicant offers statistics or documentation as evidence of their prior ability to accomplish project objectives.	0 – 5-10	
b. The applicant describes previously completed successful projects related to system or organizational development.	0 – 5-10	
* If a or b does not apply to the particular applicant, the applicant should be scored the maximum points.		
c. The applicant clearly establishes their ability to successfully complete the proposed projects.	0 – 10-20	
Total	40	
Evaluation justification:		

CRITERION	MAXIMUM POINTS TO BE AWARDED	POINTS AWARDED
5. The budget clearly identifies how the projects represent the most cost-effective use of funds to achieve the most effective outcome		
a. The budget contains no unexplained amount for “miscellaneous” or contingency	0 – 5-10	
b. The budget is detailed for each project	0 – 5-10	
c. The proposal includes a budget that clearly delineates the cost to be supported by the grant and costs to be supported by the applicant	0 –10-20	
Total	40	
Evaluation justification:		

TDH Evaluator_____

Date _____

APPLICANT _____

Initial Review of LPG Application

Regional Grading points: Score: _____

Central Office Grading Points Score : _____

Total Score: _____

Recommendation: **Full Funding:**_____ **Partial Funding:**_____ **No Funding:**_____

Amount Recommended: _____

Justification: _____

TDH Evaluator _____

Date _____

***APPLICANT** _____

Bureau Chief's Evaluation and Final LPG Application Decision

Application approved: Yes: _____ **No:** _____

Amount Awarded: _____

Justification: _____

Bureau Chief _____

Date _____